

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
			Minister of the Environment.	
11	Mike Sullivan	<p>Please consider these comments as objecting to the form, content, and adherence to the law of the Terms of Reference document related to the GO Transit Environmental Assessment for the proposed changes to the Georgetown GO Transit service and the proposed Air Rail Link. These projects have been difficult to disentangle from the beginning. Although the act applies to 'an enterprise or activity or a proposal, plan or program' of a public body, or a major commercial or business enterprise, neither is the case with respect to the Air Rail Link. There is no proposal before you for an Air Rail Link. There is no proponent of an Air Rail Link. GO Transit, who submitted the Terms of Reference for the Minister's review, admits it is not a proponent of an Air Rail Link. It has no plan or proposal for an Air Rail Link. GO Transit wishes to increase its service on the Georgetown Rail line. It does not wish to install, build, or operate an Air Rail Link. Yet it is presenting a Terms of Reference document which purports to examine alternatives for an Air Rail Link. On whose behalf is somewhat of a mystery. We would therefore demand that until there is a proponent, who can respond to questions, consult with interested parties, and act with authority on the Terms of Reference and the Environmental Assessment itself, it is not in keeping with the Act to proceed on the portion of the Environmental Assessment which deals with the Air Rail Link. It is difficult to assess which alternative is an 'alternative to' something when there isn't something proposed. In the alternative, should the minister find that a proponentless EA is appropriate to consider, we offer the following specific comment on the Terms of Reference.</p>	<p>The original concept of the Air Rail Link was to provide an express rail service between LBPIA and Union Station by maximizing the use of existing and planned future infrastructure which is also used by GO Transit. It is recognized that a private enterprise is not subject to the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, however both the Federal Government and GO Transit believe that if this service was to be introduced it is appropriate to assess the potential impacts to environment of operating this service on existing and planned future GO Transit infrastructure in addition to the GO Service Expansion. It should be noted that GO Transit will be the proponent for any new track infrastructure in the corridor.</p> <p>Due to the public concerns raised during the previous Class EA Study, GO Transit agreed to undertake this study as an Individual EA and to explore a full range of alternatives to provide service between LBPIA and Union Station. GO Transit is the proponent for any new track infrastructure in the corridor. It is recognized that 'proponent' for operation of the Airport Transportation Link component can not be determined until the evaluation of Planning Alternatives is completed because the service might be in another corridor or not at all.</p> <p>The ToR clearly outlines the justification for Planning these two project components in the same EA. This is in recognition that these projects could result in improvements within the same corridor. Referring to Section 1.1.6 of the ToR, both the GO Transit Service Expansion and the Airport Transportation Link must be considered in the same study as they cannot be planned or designed separately if the</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
			<p>result of the Environmental Assessment has both components in the same corridor sharing the same tracks.</p> <p>If the Planning Alternatives selected are within the same corridor, the two components of the EA will continue to the Evaluation of Design Alternatives, or the second stage of the process, will be clearly documented to support a traceable decision-making process and to ensure that it is understandable to those who may be affected by the decisions.</p> <p>If the preferred alternative for this component is the Air-Rail Link in the Georgetown Corridor, the Union Pearson AirLink Group (UPAG) will be the proponent for operating that service. If the preferred alternative selected is outside of the Georgetown Corridor, GO Transit will refer the Preferred Planning Alternative to the appropriate agency or jurisdiction for further review and action (i.e. if the preferred alternative is rapid transit along Eglinton Avenue, that component would be referred to the City of Toronto and TTC).</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, GO Transit will automatically be the proponent for any required infrastructure upgrades within the Georgetown South Rail Corridor.</p>	
		<p>Adherence to the Act.</p> <p>The Act requires that a proponent examine and provide the environmental advantages and disadvantages to each of the alternatives to the undertaking. GO Transit does not purport to do this.</p> <p>They have not asked for an exception under 6.1 (3) of the act, therefore we can reasonably assume that they intend to</p>	<p>Subsection 6.1 of the OEAA describes the preparation of the EA, while preparation of the ToR is described under Section 6 of the OEAA. This ToR outlines what will be studied in the EA to address the information requirements set out in Section 6.1(2) of the OEAA. The ToR is being prepared in accordance with Section 6(2)(c) of the OEAA.</p> <p>The process for evaluating 'alternatives to the undertaking' (planning alternatives) and 'alternative methods' (design</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>meet the requirements of 6.1 (2). However the terms of reference clearly suggests that the alternatives to will not be environmentally studied, but rather will be examined to determine if they can be implemented at a reasonable cost. This reasonable cost is not defined anywhere in the Terms of Reference. It can be seen from the public record that this issue has dogged the process from the very beginning, and is the subject of many, many public comments. GO's response has always been that it is their intention to examine all alternatives. And this statement was made by GO when the Class EA was abandoned in favour of the full EA. But the public, rightly, does not agree that an analysis based on criteria such as 'reasonable cost' with an admission that they do not intend to fully examine the environmental issues of each potential routing, will give a fair or transparent result.</p> <p>By way of example, the 'Blue 22' option through Weston, according to the federal minister of Transport, will not cost 'one nickel' of taxpayer's money. We suspect this to be somewhat of an exaggeration, but GO Transit has refused to break out the actual cost of the 'Blue 22' option to the taxpayer. Given that one route can therefore be built at zero cost, how can any other route ever be seriously considered, according to GO's 'reasonable cost' cull of the potential options. We believe that an environmental assessment must provide environmental advantages and disadvantages, and GO will not be doing that for almost all of the 'alternatives to'. This makes a mockery of the assertion that they will be evaluating all possible alternatives, and in turn is in violation of the act. We have asked, and continue to ask, that all alternatives be evaluated fully, on their environmental impacts. We therefore urge the minister to reject a Terms of Reference which describes an Environmental Assessment</p>	<p>alternatives) will consider the advantages and disadvantages of various options. It is recognized that the first step of the process of the evaluation of planning alternatives does not include environmental factors. The rationale for this is clearly documented in the ToR and was discussed extensively at PLC Meetings and Public Meetings held to assist in the development of the ToR. The primary rationale for this is that the Project Team to examine all alternatives suggested by the public without eliminating any at the ToR stage no mater how 'unreasonable' they were.</p> <p>As noted in the ToR, the objective of the first step of the evaluation process is to determine whether an alternative is reasonable. It is recognized that first step does not include an examination of potential environmental effects. However the rationale for this approach is that if an alternative does not address the purpose of the study to a meaningful degree at a reasonable cost it would not be considered a reasonable alternative no matter how high or low the potential environment effects were. Potential environmental effects will be considered in the second step of the planning alternatives (alternatives to the undertaking) process as well as during the evaluation of Design Alternatives.</p> <p>To address concerns of the public that only one alternative would pass the 'reasonableness test', the Project Team did agree to carry more than one of the corridors identified in Section 5.1.2 to the second step of the process. This commitment is clearly identified on page 25 of the ToR.</p>	

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>which will NOT evaluate or present the environmental advantages and disadvantages or all the 'alternatives to' for the Air Rail Link.</p>		
		<p>Places To Grow Act</p> <p>GO has only recently added the 'Places to Grow' Act, and in particular the growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe as part of its justification for the Air Rail Link. Yet they have excerpted the Plan out of context to justify their decisions. The Plan has some principles (See Section 3.2.3), including a preference for public transit. Yet the Air Rail Link as originally proposed, would not meet those principles. GO has also suggested by a reference to Schedule 5 (page 4) that the link to the airport from the Georgetown corridor is a decision already made by the province. Schedule 5 and accompanying documents clearly state that any markings are illustrative, not to scale, and are not indicative of final decisions. Without having had an opportunity to review the relevance of this Plan, including discussions with various provincial ministries, it is impossible for the public to determine if this is, in fact, a final decision of the government or merely a fuzzy grey line on a map. In addition, the Places to Grow act seems to favour neighbourhood connective transit systems, yet GO's Terms of Reference makes neighbourhood connectivity a secondary purpose to the Air Rail Link. This in turn means that even if neighbourhood connective transit is a desirable (and Plan mandated) possibility of one of the potential routes, if the neighbourhood connections get in the way of the prime purpose of ferrying business travelers between Pearson Airport and Union Station, those connections will not be an outcome of the EA. We have asked, and continue to ask, that in keeping with the spirit and intent of "Places to Grow" that the Terms of Reference be modified to indicate a</p>	<p>The Places to Grow reference (Section 1.1.3) is Provincial planning policy and was requested to be added as part of our discussions with the Ministry of the Environment's interim EA Facilitator. These discussions occurred immediately prior to the submission of the ToR following the PLC meetings.</p> <p>Schedule 5 does not supersede any decisions under the Environmental Assessment Act.</p>	<p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>preference for local benefits to any transit alternatives. Again we would urge the minister to reject a Terms of Reference which misinterprets the legislation of the province to justify its decisions.</p>		
		<p><b>Purpose of the Air Rail Link</b></p> <p>One of the key elements of an Environmental Assessment is the notion that a public 'need' must be met, and that a major undertaking must be built to address that public 'need', and that the environment must be protected as far as it can be. GO Transit has not established a 'need' giving rise to the Air Rail Link. There have been numerous studies on the topic, most suggesting it was not a practical thing. GO tries to argue that Toronto would be at a competitive disadvantage if it did not have one of these. They have published lists of cities which have some form of link, but we feel it is comparing apples to oranges. Some of the links are commuter rail, some are subway-like, and only one or two are the kind of link originally proposed by the federal government. There is no backup documentation for the assertion about the competitive disadvantage. There is also no indication that the targeting of business and some tourist traffic is somehow to provide an environmental benefit, or serves a need not provided by any other means. For this reason, we believe the purpose of the undertaking to be seriously flawed. We urge the minister to reject a Terms of Reference whose underpinning is not based on a clearly documented and justified public 'need' or purpose.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the EA Study has not been completed yet. We are only at the ToR stage and therefore 'need' can not fully be identified at this time. Need is typically identified at the end of the planning process and is determined if the 'overall advantages' of the project are considered better than the 'overall disadvantages'. This concept is supported by numerous EA Board decisions on the concept of 'need' in the context of EA planning.</p> <p>At this stage of the process we have only identified a purpose (problems and/or opportunities) and a range of potential alternatives to address this purpose. The purpose is clearly identified in Section 2.2 of the ToR.</p>	N
		<p><b>Fatal Inconsistency</b></p> <p>The Terms of Reference states:</p> <p><b>"1.1.6 Initiation of the Air-Rail Link Project</b> Working with GO Transit in determining possible funding for</p>		N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>proposed GO Transit expansion, Transport Canada identified an opportunity to use excess capacity within the Georgetown Corridor to provide enhanced transportation service from Union Station to LBPIA. The work to determine the interest and feasibility of an Airport Transportation Link from Union Station to LBPIA was initiated in April 2001 when Transport Canada released a Request for Expressions of Interest (EOI) specifically for a rail link from Union Station to the LBPIA." Later it also states: (page 12) "Because of both track capacity and operating restrictions, commuter rail service between Union Station and Georgetown is currently limited to four peak period trains in the peak direction with some off-peak bi-directional service."</p> <p>This inconsistency presents yet another problem with the Terms of Reference. Again without a proponent for an Air Rail Link, we are faced with the notion that the rationale for the originally proposed Link was to take advantage of 'excess' capacity within the Georgetown corridor. Yet this selfsame EA purports to justify the GO expansion on the basis that there are capacity and operating restrictions which make it impossible to meet current needs. As the corridors referred to in the two paragraphs are the same, one statement is patently false. We cannot decide which one it is. We urge the minister to reject a terms of reference whose underpinnings are so clearly flawed and inconsistent.</p>	<p>It should be obvious that the "excess capacity" mentioned is not referring to the existing limited track infrastructure. If and when GO expands the track infrastructure to meet its long term needs there will inherently be operating windows for other services including VIA and freight.</p>	
		<p><b>Evaluation Methods</b></p> <p>We have been advised by several EA experts, and by members of Provincial Parliament, that the Terms of Reference will be the bible by which the EA will be accomplished. Anything not in the Terms of Reference will simply be unchallengeable later. GO Transit would have us believe otherwise. When we have complained (as many</p>	<p>As discussed at numerous PLC Meetings and Public Meetings it is not possible to understand the importance the various factors will play in the decision making process until the extent and significance of the impacts are known.</p> <p>The methodology for assessing/evaluating alternatives was enhanced in an attempt to better explain this concept. This concept is outlined in Section 5.2.3 and is also more fully</p>	<p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>have done) that we cannot tell from this terms of Reference what systems, yardsticks, or values they will use when making their environmental 'trade offs' they merely tell us that if they are unreasonable AFTER THE FACT, that we can ask the minister to reject the EA on that basis. We know that is a much more difficult hurdle to overcome. We fail to see why GO transit cannot, or will not, put into the terms of reference what measures, yardsticks, values etc. they will use when making their environmental 'trade offs'. It will be impossible to fairly and confidently predict the outcomes of the environmental assessment if the evaluations methodology is completely unknown. We so request that a Terms of Reference which has no specific measures and values to indicate how these trade-offs will be made, be rejected by the minister as being vague and unintelligible by the public.</p>	<p>explained in Section 6.2.</p>	
		<p>Socio-Economic environment.</p> <p>This is a key portion of the act, and GO Transit has consistently given this item less than the desired attention. It is a key feature of the reason the village of Weston is reacting so strongly to this proposal. The Socio-Economic reality is that the village is on very shaky economic footings, particularly in the business centre of the town. Any disruption will have an immediate impact on the viability of the businesses and its Business Improvement Area or BIA's ability to function. The Blue 22 original proposal would have killed the economic hub. Even the modified proposal would have damaged it greatly. It is for this reason that the citizens want the socio-economics to be given the attention it deserves in this study. However, at most opportunities to respond to questions, GO refers to 'nuisance effects' and 'access' issues. They clearly don't understand the fragile dynamics at work here. And their lack of concern was made</p>	<p>We feel that by examining potential impacts to noise, air quality, aesthetics, access and direct displacement impacts we will be able to access potential impacts to the socio-economic environment.</p>	<p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>very evident by their advice in response to a question that their socio-economic expert they have hired is a noise and vibration engineer. We have not found his credentials to include being a socioeconomics expert. Hence we need some amendments to the Terms of Reference which will ensure that the socio-economic impacts of the various options will be studied in detail, by real experts, and with a real view to understanding the real potential impacts, and whether these are mitigable. Without these amendments, we must urge the minister to reject the Terms of Reference.</p>		
		<p>Mitigation</p> <p>On a number of occasions, concerned citizens have demanded to know what GO will do if their property values decrease as a result of the incursion of these new trains. GO's routine answer is to suggest that in some situations property values go up, and in some they go down. But they will look at it and try to build walls, etc. to return the area as best as possible to pre-construction condition. Unfortunately once again, we are hamstrung by having no proponent. GO Transit will not be building or running an ARL. As designed it is fairly certain that Blue 22 would cause serious property value diminishing in any of the communities it whizzed by. They are right that some forms of transit do cause values to go up. Subways in particular have that effect, as local access to rapid transit is enhanced, thus nullifying the nuisance effect. However in this case, the plan does not include local access to rapid transit. Even if it were to stop in Weston the price makes it unreasonable as a local transit option. So there is virtually no chance that property values will go up. They have already gone down. Unfortunately, the notion of mitigation of this, either by purchasing depreciated property at pre-depreciation prices, or compensating losses directly, is not included in the terms of reference. And the</p>	<p>Our response to potential impacts on property value and proposed approach is consistent with the approach of all transportation service providers in the Province.</p> <p>Our response has been that the research and literature on this subject indicates, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure can have a positive effect on property values if it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). This study will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>As noted previously, GO Transit will be the proponent for all infrastructure improvements in the Georgetown Corridor (if it is selected as the preferred alternative) and will review and examine mitigation measures in an attempt to bring effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	N



**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>proponent of the Air Rail Link, which is not a public body but a private, profit making consortium, can reap those profits at the expense of the properties along the line. They should be held to account, and without their presence at the EA, nor the specific reference to the possibility in the Terms of Reference, residents rightly presume they will get nothing. The terms of reference must include the possibility of property value compensation, in this circumstance. We ask that the minister reject a terms of reference which does not specifically include the concept of property value devaluation, and compensation for same as a method of mitigation.</p>		
		<p>Consultation</p> <p>The development of a Terms of Reference is meant to include meaningful consultation with interested parties. The consultation so far has had a number of problems. Public notices of Public Information Centres apparently had the wrong day on the notice. We have no idea how many individuals did not have an opportunity to attend a Public Information Centre as a result of this. Neither public information centre in Weston had sufficient copies of the draft terms of reference for the public to peruse during the meeting. GO Transit held two Public Information Centres in Weston. The second was Wednesday, Sept 13 (advertised as Thursday, Sept 13). However, in the notices for the second meeting, GO advised the public that their deadline for comments on the Terms of Reference was August 11, 2006. The public therefore was understandably of the view that the Sept 13 meeting was a waste of time, as the deadline had passed. GO later agreed to accept comments after Sept 13, but this was not done as part of another public notice. There were numerous problems with the Public Liaison Committee, and you can see from the 'minutes' that</p>	<p>The comment that the Project Team had a draft of a ToR in advance of the first PLC meeting is false. The first draft of any document reassembling a ToR was prepared in advance of PLC #3 and was titled 'Preliminary Outline of the ToR'. As discussed further in this response, the comments that we received at all PLC meetings, Public meetings and reviews by government agencies shaped the final version of the ToR submitted to MOE for an approval decision. Specific changes made include, but are not limited to, how the purpose statement was drafted, the range of alternatives being considered, the criteria proposed to be used to evaluate alternatives, the commitment to carry more than one planning alternative to the second step of the evaluation process, etc.</p> <p>We do agree that the first PLC meeting was 'heavy on process issues'. However, the Independent Facilitator felt it was important to spend time discussing the format, mandate and structure of the PLC. Having said that, the primarily focus of consultation during the ToR Stage are process</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>all of the meetings were heavy on process issues and left very little time for discussion or consultation on the Terms of Reference. We requested that the terms of reference creation itself be a consultative process. GO did not allow that type of process to take place, instead preparing a draft and asking for comments. They presumably had this 'draft' in their possession during the first meetings of the Public Liaison Committee, in spite of their assurances otherwise, as they have indicated in the public record that comments made in those early meetings caused changes to the terms of reference. GO refused to show us the final draft before it was submitted.</p> <p>In addition several persons who wished to be part of the consultation process in the Public Liaison Committee were specifically denied that opportunity. GO initially used the size of the committee as a limitation, but when most of their invitees failed to show up, they then refused some on the grounds that there would be too many from one area, and others on the grounds that elected officials were not welcome.</p> <p>Please see my letter to you of July 7 for additional comments on the lack of consultation. My last letter to the "proponent", on September 22nd, was never replied to. Instead I only found the "proponent's" comments in the public record document attached to the terms of reference.</p>	<p>issues (i.e. purpose of the study, the range and types of alternatives to be considered, the process to generate and evaluate alternatives and the way to consult stakeholders during the process).</p> <p>We had an extensive discussion of the study purpose at PLC #1 that has resulted in modifications to the ToR. The focus of PLC #2 was range and types of alternatives. Once again this resulted in significant discussions and modifications to the ToR. PLC #3 focused on the evaluation process and we distributed a Preliminary Outline of the Terms of Reference. This document was revised based on the comments that were received at the meeting and reissued to the broader public as the draft Terms of Reference. Our intent to do this is clearly noted on Page 16 of the minutes of PLC #3. Once again changes were made to the Draft ToR that was released to the broader public in advance of the June Public Meetings. We acknowledge that the members of the PLC were not given longer than 48 hours prior to the PLC #3 to review the evaluation discussion paper and preliminary outline of the ToR, however we felt that the presentation and subsequent discussion was valuable and noted that comments and questions on the document are welcome at any point.</p> <p>PLC #4 was not as effective as had been hoped. To address this, we met with the submitter to discuss his comments in detail on July 17 and arranged an additional PLC meeting for July 31. At both of those meetings we provided responses to his questions and comments and discussed ways to incorporate some of the suggestions into the version of the ToR that will be submitted to MOE.</p> <p>With regards to the comment regarding when comments on</p>	

GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
 Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
 Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
			<p>the draft ToR will be considered our letter of invitation to the follow-up public meeting in the Weston Community stated:  <i>"We would appreciate your comments on the draft Terms of Reference by August 11, 2006. This will allow the Project Team to address most of the substantial comments from the public and agencies in a timely fashion. Any additional comments arising from the September public meeting will also be considered before we complete our final Terms of Reference document.</i></p> <p><i>The continuation of the June 21st, 2006 meeting will be held on September 13, 2006 at the Faith Sanctuary (1901 Jane Street) starting at 6:30 pm. Following this session, we will review and consider any additional comments received, complete the Terms of Reference and then submit it to the Ontario Minister of the Environment for a decision on approval. As part of the approval process the Minister will initiate an additional (30 calendar day) public and agency review of the document prior to making a decision. This will provide another opportunity for public input."</i></p> <p>Although comments regarding the draft Terms of Reference were encouraged by August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006, any comments/input at the September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting and a week following the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting were also considered and addressed (to ensure those attending the meeting have time to comment).</p> <p>We apologize that the website advertised the public meeting as Thursday September 13<sup>th</sup> instead of Wednesday September 13<sup>th</sup>. The newspaper notice advertised the correct date as did the letters that were sent.</p>	

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
 Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
 Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
			<p>With regards to your comments about the PLC, it should be noted that the PLC was formed to provide an additional forum for the Project Team to obtain input from residents, businesses and other stakeholders and to ensure public views are given serious and respectful consideration. The Project Team feels that it is important to have representation from the broader study area as alternatives outside the Georgetown Corridor are being considered.</p> <p>The Project Team has made efforts to get full representation out to each meeting and has been accommodating to the Weston Community in terms of membership. Two Historical Societies representing Weston issues requested to be added to the PLC. The Project Team suggested that it would be appropriate for the groups to select one member to sit on the committee. With regards to the participation for City Councillors and School Trustees, it has been noted that the PLC is not a political committee and that it is not appropriate for elected officials to be members. Elected officials have never been excluded from attending as observers, and like all observers they have been given the opportunities to share their views at the end of the meetings.</p> <p>As you have pointed out, the attendance at each of the PLC meetings has not included representatives from all of the community/neighbourhood groups. We have attempted to have full attendance at these meetings; however, we do recognize the challenges that individual members have given their personal time commitments.</p>	
		<p>And finally, though we asked many times for a comprehensive analysis of the problem sought to be solved by the Air Rail Link, and sought reports and studies leading</p>	<p>Section 1.1.5 provides a summary of the numerous previous reports related to enhanced transportation service to the airport. This information was requested to be added by the</p>	<p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link  
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference  
Response to Public/ Interest Group Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 27, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		to that conclusion, most of the studies referred to in the Terms of Reference were never discussed, nor were copies made available to the PLC or the public. And the 'Places to Grow' act and the companion plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, were never discussed, nor was their linkage to the project indicated in any way prior to the publication of the document. It is a significant and alarming failing. Much of the justification for the project and its potential routing is alleged by GO to come from that legislation and plan, and there was no opportunity to discuss or analyze this on this basis. Given our problems with the lack of a proponent and the general vagueness of the purpose, it should have been discussed vigorously by the interested parties, prior to the filing of the Terms of Reference.	<p>PLC, members of the general public and many agencies. The intent of this section is to provide a historical context.</p> <p>The Places to Grow reference (Section 1.1.3) is Provincial planning policy and was requested to be added as part of our discussions with the Ministry of the Environment's interim EA Facilitator.</p>	
12	Mary Louise Ashbourne	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expansion of GO Transit through the Weston Corridor is accepted by the communities along the rail corridor, even though we realize it will constitute a 30% increase in daily rail traffic, as it will be of benefit to those who live and work in Toronto.</li> <li>2. An Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station added to the present rail traffic and the GO Transit expansion will constitute a 350% increase in daily rail traffic and will be unacceptably damaging to the environment, the built heritage and will sever and ultimately destroy the historic community/neighbourhood of the former Town of Weston. It is projected to be a benefit to the elite business person flying into Pearson for business meetings in downtown Toronto.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Potential impacts to Weston (and all communities) will be assessed as part of this EA. Criteria to assess planning alternatives are outlined in Table 5.1 and include measures to examine potential nuisance effects (noise, air quality and aesthetics), as well as potential impacts to community features and economic development. Once a corridor has been identified additional engineering and environmental assessment work will be carried out to more fully examine potential effects and possible mitigation measures. These factors are outlined in Section 6.2.1 of the Terms of Reference. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</li> </ol>	N
		The object of the Terms of Reference is an assessment of the cost of construction of the ARL with reference to several suggested corridors with the Weston Corridor being noted	This study is currently in the Terms of Reference phase of the Environmental Assessment and a preferred planning (corridor) alternative has not been identified yet. The specific	N